

posed to committing the State and the Democratic party to prohibition. First. Because the people had not declared in favor of it—the matter not having been considered or discussed prior to the recent election. Second. Because prohibition has not been a success in the States where it has been adopted. But that I was in favor of temperance and in favor of restrictive or local option laws, and would support all measures in that direction, when a majority of the people desired same. That I was opposed to the London bill as introduced, because it was practically a prohibition bill, but had its introducer or the committee amended the bill by striking out section 5 and modified the wine section by adding brandy, I would have supported it, with the understanding that I would vote to exempt any county from the operation of same where the Senator of that county so requested and voted. No amendment as indicated having been made or offered, I supported the Warren-Vann substitute for the London bill, which was more in accordance with my views. When, afterwards, the Watts bill reached the Senate from the House of Representatives, and was offered as a substitute for the London bill and the Warren-Vann substitute, I supported same, stating at the time, publicly in the Senate, that I would vote to exempt any county desired by a Senator from the operation of said Watts bill, and did so vote. My position, I claim, was entirely consistent, Peter Plain, alias Josiah William Bailey, to the contrary notwithstanding. I am not surprised at the statement of Mr. Bailey, because, in my speech opposing the London bill I used Mr. Bailey's editorials appearing in his paper bearing date September 14th and November 12th, 1902 (which I considered good argument), in support of my position. Said editorials did not support, and were not consistent with, the position and argument of the manager (Mr. Bailey) of the Anti-Saloon League, made before committee when the London bill was under consideration, but